

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2003, claim 20 has been cancelled and claims 13, 14, 15, 18 and 19 have been amended. Claims 13-19 are now active in this application, of which claims 13 and 18 are independent.

Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

***Drawing Objection***

In the Office Action, drawings have been objected to for failing to designate Fig. 1 by a proper legend. This objection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, Applicants submit corrected drawings in separate paper attached hereafter, in which Fig. 1 is designated with "Prior Art". Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

***Abstract Objection***

In the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure has been objected to for containing more than 150 words. This objection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, the abstract has been amended to reduce the number of the words therein to less than 150 words. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

In the Office Action, claims 13-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,309,264 issued to Lien, *et al.* ("Lien"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In this response, independent claim 13 has been amended to clarify its claimed features and to incorporate the limitations of its dependent claim 14. Amended claim 13 recites (a) " the first opening pattern and the second opening pattern overlap each other to divide the pixel electrode into a plurality of sub-regions", (b) "the plurality of sub-regions comprising *the sub-regions being polygonal in shape and having two longest sides parallel to each other*", and (c) the sub-regions having the two longest sides parallel to each other are classified into *a first type sub-region* having the longest sides arranged in a first direction and *a second type sub-region* having the longest sides arranged in a second direction *different from the first direction*".

In this regard, in Fig. 5 of Lien, the two sub-regions near the short sides of the bottom electrode 90 and the two sub-regions near the cutout 91 have a triangular shape and hence do not have two longest sides parallel to each other.

The other four sub-regions of which the longest side is parallel to the longest sides of the bottom electrode 90 have two longest sides that are parallel to each other. However, the two longest sides of these sub-regions are all arranged in the same direction. Thus, Lien fails to teach or suggest "the sub-regions ... are classified into *a first type sub-region* having the longest sides arranged in a first direction, and *a second type sub-region* having the longest sides arranged in a second direction *different from the first direction*".

Thus, it is submitted that claim 13 is patentable over Lien. Claims 14-17 that are dependent from claim 13 would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 13-17 be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

In the Office Action, claims 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Lien. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 18 recites (a) “the pixel electrode has a plurality of sub-regions that are divided by the orienting directions of the liquid crystal molecules included therein when voltage is applied between the pixel electrode and the common electrode” and (b) “the sub-regions having the two longest sides parallel to each other are classified into *a first type subs-region having the longest sides arranged in a first direction* and *a second type sub-region having the longest sides arranged in a second direction different from the first direction*”.

As previously mentioned, Lien does not teach or suggest these claimed features. No secondary reference has been introduced to cure the deficiency from the teachings of Lien. It would not have been obvious to modify the teachings of Lien to arrive at the claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claim 18 is patentable over Lien. Claim 19 that is dependent from claim 18 would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 18-19 be withdrawn.

***Other Matters***


In this response, claims 14 and 19 have been amended to be consistent with the amendments made in their respective independent claims 13 and 18, and claim 15 has been amended for better wording.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 13-19 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 11, 2003

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP:WSC/kbs

**Attachment: Abstract of Disclosure (Amended)  
Corrected Drawings (Fig. 1)**